

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.          | FILING DATE                       | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR    | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/011,029               | 11/13/2001                        | Chandrashekar R. Padala | 42390P13128         | 7523             |
| ****                     | 7590 07/19/200<br>KOLOFF TAYLOR & | EXAMINER                |                     |                  |
| 1279 OAKME               | AD PARKWAY                        | SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R   |                     |                  |
| SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040 |                                   |                         | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                          |                                   |                         | · 2145              |                  |
|                          |                                   |                         |                     | •                |
|                          |                                   |                         | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                          |                                   |                         | 07/19/2007          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|   |  | St  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summers   | 10/011,029   | PADALA, CHANDRASHEKAR R.  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary   | Examiner   | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |
| 71 11411 110 0477 444   | Jeffrey R. Swearingen  | 2145  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication ap<br>Period for Reply   | pears on the cover sheet with the  | correspondence address  |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Descriptions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1, after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  | DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON  | ON.<br>timely filed<br>om the mailing date of this communication.<br>NED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |
| Status  | •  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 A   | <u> April 2007</u> .   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2a)⊠ This action is FINAL. 2b)☐ Thi   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under  | Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,   | 453 O.G. 213.   |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/   | awn from consideration.  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the option of the specific and the specific | cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ction is required if the drawing(s) is continuous.  | See 37 CFR 1.85(a).<br>objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).                                    |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document  2. Certified copies of the priority document  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list  | nts have been received.  Its have been received in Application or the second or the se | ation No ived in this National Stage  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date  | 4) Interview Summa<br>Paper No(s)/Mail<br>5) Notice of Informa<br>6) Other:  | Date  |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/011,029

#### DETAILED ACTION

# Response to Arguments

- 1. Applicant's amendments have overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.
- 2. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.
- 3. The server in Redlich is inherently present on some sort of computer or device. Redlich does disclose "the second network server device configured to respond to a request for a peer device address of one of the first plurality of peer devices by querying the first network server device such that the second network server device responds to the request with the peer device address of the one of the first plurality of peer devices as though the request was for a peer device address of one of the second plurality of peer devices." Forwarding the DNS query is responding to a request for a peer device.
- 4. Applicant argued Redlich did not disclose a hierarchical network. Applicant claimed the first and second network servers were at equivalent hierarchical levels, not the presence of a hierarchical network.
- 5. Applicant argued Redlich failed to teach a common zone relationship. Applicant failed to define a common zone relationship clearly in the specification. Redlich meets Applicant's claim language.
- 6. Appliant argued Redlich failed to disclose address discovery by access authorization. Applicant's claim language does not require any address discovery to take place, but "permits" it.
- 7. Applicant repeats the above arguments.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Application/Control Number: 10/011,029

- 9. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Redlich (US 6,591,306 B1).
- 10. In regard to claims 1, 8, Redlich disclosed:

a first plurality of peer devices, each of the first plurality of peer devices not being directly coupled to any other of the first plurality of peer devices; Figure 4, Figure 5, Figure 8

a first network server device directly coupled to each of the first plurality of peer devices, the first network server device to manage and maintain a first name-to-address resolution index that includes a list of addresses for each of the first plurality of peer devices, the first network server device configured to respond to requests for a peer device addresses of the first plurality of peer devices by querying the first name-to-address index; column 7, lines 61-65, column 8, line 6

a second plurality of peer devices, each of the second plurality of peer devices not being directly coupled to any other of the first and second pluralities of peer devices; Figure 8

a second network server device directly coupled to each of the second plurality of peer devices and to the first network server device, the second network server device to manage and maintain a second name-to-address resolution index that includes a list of addresses for each of the second plurality of peer devices, the second network server configured to respond to a request for a peer device address of one of the first plurality of peer devices by querying the first network server device such that the second network server device responds to the request with the peer device address of the one of the first plurality of peer devices as though the request was for a peer device address of one of the second plurality of peer devices. Column 8, lines 1-18 In regard to claims 2, 11, Redlich disclosed:

the first and second network server devices are at equivalent hierarchical levels. Column 8, lines 15-18

12. In regard to claims 3, 12, Redlich disclosed:

11.

Art Unit: 2145

15.

the first and second network server devices have a common zone relationship. Column 8, lines 11-15

13. In regard to claims 4, 13, 16, 20, Redlich disclosed:

the second network server devices requires access authorization from the first network server device before a common zone is established to permit address discovery of the first plurality of peer devices. Access authorization is inherent to any network. Applicant has not stated the type of access authorization, so access authorization is broadly construed as the establishment of access through a connection.

14. In regard to claim 5, Redlich disclosed:

a third plurality of peer devices, each of the third plurality of peer devices not being directly coupled to any other of the first, second, and third pluralities of peer devices; Figure 8

a third network server device directly coupled to each of the third plurality of peer devices and to the second network server device, the third network server device to manage and maintain a third name-to-address resolution index that includes a list of addresses for each of the third plurality of peer devices, the third network server device configured to respond to the request for the peer device address of the one of the first plurality of peer devices by querying the second network server device such that the third network server device responds to the request with the peer device address of the one of the first plurality of peer devices as though the request was for a peer device address of one of the third plurality of peer devices. Column 8, lines 1-18 In regard to claim 6, Redlich disclosed:

the second network server device is also configured to query the third name-to-address index such that the second network server device responds to a request for a peer device address of one of the third plurality of peer devices as though the request was for a peer device address of one of the second plurality of peer devices. Column 8, lines 1-18

16. In regard to claim 7, Redlich disclosed:

the first network server device is also configured to query the second name-to-address index such that the first network server device responds to a request for a peer device address of

Application/Control Number: 10/011,029

Page 5

Art Unit: 2145

one of the second plurality of peer devices as though the request was for a peer device address of one of the first plurality of peer devices. Column 8, lines 1-18

17. In regard to claim 9, Redlich disclosed:

an output interface to couple the processing unit to the at least one peer on the first network. Figure 8

18. In regard to claims 10, 15, 19 Redlich disclosed:

the processing unit responds to a name-to-address resolution request by sending the requested address if it is found, and sending an address not found reply if the address is not found. Column 9, lines 13-24

- 19. Claims 14, 18 have the same limitations as claims 1-3.
- 20. In regard to claims 17, 21, Redlich disclosed:

there is no common zone relationship between the first server and the second server, and derivative common zone name-to-address resolution is selectively permitted by a server having common zone relationships with the first server and the second server. Column 8, lines 11-15

## Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Cohen et al.

US 7,082.476 B1

Seng et al.

US 2001/0047429 A1

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Swearingen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

lason Cardone

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2145

**JRS**